UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,014	01/31/2001	Prabahkar Subramaniam	500048.01	7475

24504 7590 12/01/2004

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW
STE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER	
BOUTAH, ALINA A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/775,014	SUBRAMANIAM, PRABAHKAR	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alina N Boutah	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 August 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment received August 6, 2004. No claim has been amended. Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,523,022 issued to Hobbs.

Regarding claim 1, Hobbs teaches a method of providing a user access to computer resources on a target computer system, the method comprising:

under control of a client computer system, initiating a user request to access a desired computer resource in the target computer system (figures 2-4; col. 13, lines 50-67);

under control of an interface component on a server computer system, receiving the user request and initiating a remote invocation of a user component object on the target computer system in response to the user request (figures 2-4; col. 13, lines 50 to col. 14, line 16); and

receiving the remote invocation on the target computer system and, in response to the remote invocation, invoking the user component object to access the desired computer resource and obtain user information from the accessed computer resource, the user component object resource, the user information to the interface component on the server computer system which, in turn, sends the user information to the client computer system (figures 2-4 and 10; col. 26, lines 7-24).

Regarding claim 2, Hobbs teaches the method of claim 1 wherein a Web browser executing on the client computer system initiates the user request (figure 6).

Regarding claim 3, Hobbs teaches the method of claim 1 wherein initiating the remote invocation corresponds to a distributed component object model communication, and that user component object returns the user information via a distributed component object model communication (figures 2-4; col. 13, lines 50 to col. 14, line 16).

Regarding claim 4, Hobbs teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the interface component includes an active server page through which the user request is received and the corresponding user information is provided to the client computer system (col. 16, lines 12-29).

Regarding claim 5, Hobbs teaches the method of claim 4 wherein communication between the active server page component and the client computer system comprises communication via a secure communications protocol (col. 22, lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 6, Hobbs teaches the method of claim 1 wherein receiving the remote invocation on the target computer system and returning the user information to the interface component on the server computer system includes authenticating the interface component that initiated the remote invocation and determining whether the interface component has access to the user component object (abstract).

Regarding claim 7, Hobbs teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the target computer system corresponds to a company's internal computer system and the client computer system corresponds to a business partner of the company, and the user request corresponds to business information stored on the company's internal computer system that the business partner is permitted to access (col. 1, line 46 to col. 2, line 5).

Regarding claim 8, Hobbs teaches a method of providing a user access to computer resources on a target computer system, the method comprising:

under control of an interface component on a server computer system, receiving a user request to access a desired computer resource in the target computer system, initiating a remote invocation of a user component object on the target computer system in response to the received user request, under control of the user component object on the target computer system, receiving the remote invocation (figures 2-4; col. 13, lines 50 to col. 14, line 16);

in response to the remote invocation, invoking the user component object to access the desired computer resource and obtain user information from the accessed computer resource (figures 2-4; col. 13, lines 50 to col. 14, line 16);

returning the user information to the interface component on the server computer system, and under control of the interface component on the server computer system, providing the returned user information to a sender of the user request (figures 2-4; col. 13, lines 50 to col. 14, line 16).

Regarding claim 9, Hobbs teaches the method of claim 8 wherein the user request corresponds to an HTTP request received from a Web browser (figure 2).

Regarding claim 10, Hobbs teaches the method of claim 8 wherein initiating the remote invocation corresponds to a distributed component object model communication, and the user component object returns the user information via a distributed component object model communication (figure 2).

Regarding claim 11, Hobbs teaches the method of claim 8 wherein the interface component includes an active server page through which the user request is received and the corresponding user information is provided to the client computer system (col. 16, lines 12-29).

Regarding claim 12, Hobbs teaches the method of claim 11 wherein communication between the active server page and the client computer system comprises communication through a secure communications protocol (col. 22, lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 13, Hobbs teaches the method of claim 8 wherein receiving the remote invocation and returning the user information to the interface component on the server computer system includes authenticating the interface component that initiated the remote invocation and determining whether the interface component has access to the user component object (abstract).

Regarding claim 14, Hobbs teaches the method of claim 8 wherein the target computer system corresponds to a company's internal computer system and the client computer system corresponds to a business partner of the company, and the user request corresponds to information stored on the company's internal computer system that the business partner is permitted to access (col. 1, line 46 to col. 2, line 5).

Regarding claim 15, Hobbs teaches a system for providing a remote user with access to resources on a computer system, comprising:

a first server computer system including a plurality of computer resources and including a user component object, the user component object being adapted to receive a remote invocation and operable in response to the remote invocation to access a computer resource and obtain corresponding user information, the user component object outputting the obtained user information (figures 3 and 4; col. 13, lines 50 to col. 14, line 16); and

a second server computer system coupled to the first server and including an interface component that is adapted to receive a user request to access a desired computer resource, the interface component applying the remote invocation to the user component object in response to the received user request, and the interface component receiving the obtained user information

corresponding to the applied remote invocation and providing the user information to a sender of the user request (figures 3 and 4; col. 13, lines 50 to col. 14, line 16).

Regarding claim 16, Hobbs teaches the computer system of claim 15 wherein the user component object comprises a DCOM object (col. 14, line 11).

Regarding claim 17, Hobbs teaches the computer system of claim 15 wherein the second server computer system comprises a Web server (abstract).

Regarding claim 18, Hobbs teaches the computer system of claim 15 wherein the first server computer system further comprises a firewall coupled between the first and second server computer systems, the firewall monitoring each communication between the first and second computer systems and permitting only communications that satisfy specified security criteria (figure 4).

Regarding claim 19, Hobbs teaches a computer system for providing a user access to resources on the computer system, comprising:

a first server computer system including an active server page adapted to receive user requests from a browser program, the active server page operable in response to the user request to generate a page data request and to receive page data responsive to the page data request, and the active server page providing a Web page including the received page data to the browser (figures 2-4; col. 13, lines 50 to col. 14, line 16);

a component object wrapper coupled to the active server page, the component object wrapper translating data in the page data request into a second data format and generating a component call responsive to receiving the page data request from the active server component, and the component object wrapper receiving user data corresponding to the component call and translating the user data into page data and returning the page data to the active server page (col. 13, lines 50 to col. 14, line 16);

component object stub coupled to the component object wrapper, the component object stub generating a remote invocation command responsive to the component call from the component object wrapper and being adapted to receive user data returned in response to the remote invocation and to provide the user data to the component object wrapper (figure 3, col. 15, lines 4-16); and

a second server computer system coupled to the component object stub, the second server computer system including a plurality of computer resources and further including a user component object, the user component object accessing the plurality of computer resources to obtain user data in response to the remote invocation command and returning the user data to the component object stub (figure 3; col. 13, lines 50 to col. 14, line 16).

Regarding claim 20, Hobbs teaches the computer system of claim 19 wherein the user component object comprises a DCOM object (col. 14, line 11).

Regarding claim 21, Hobbs teaches the computer system of claim 19 wherein the second server computer system further includes a firewall component that monitors communications to

and from the second server computer system including the remote invocation commands and returned user data communicated between the user component object and the component object stub and permits only communications that satisfy specified security criteria (figure 4).

Regarding claim 22, Hobbs teaches the computer system of claim 19 wherein the first server computer system comprises a Web server (abstract).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 6, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Hobbs fails to teach, disclose or suggest at least the feature of "remote invocation of an object... on the target system." The Patent Office respectfully disagrees and submits that this limitation is taught in figures 2-4 as well as col. 13, lines 50 to col. 14, line 16 of Hobbs reference. Specifically, the cited figures teach a client initiating a request to a server to access a resource on the data warehouse (interpreted as a target computer system). In response to the client request, the server connects to the data warehouse, finds and retrieves the requested resource and returns it to the client. Col. 13, lines 60 thru col. 14, line 16 of Hobbs teaches the server obtaining the requested resource by using various APIs such as Java's Remote Method Invocation or RMI (col. 14, lines 15-16). Through the use of RMI, the remote invocation on the data warehouse is received and the client is able to access the desired resource. Therefore, Hobbs does teach the claimed limitation.

Applicant argues that Hobbs fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least the feature of "wherein initiating the remote invocation corresponds to a distributed component object model communication." The Patent Office respectfully submits that this feature is being taught in col. 14, line 11 of Hobbs. Specifically, the cited area of the reference teaches a server connecting to the data warehouse thru the use of various protocols such as distributed component object model communication, also known as DCOM.

Applicant argues that Hobbs fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least the feature of "wherein... the client computer system corresponds to a business partner of the company." However, Applicant admits that Hobbs discloses the client being a customer although it is not equivalent to a business partner as recited in the claims (pages 5-6 of Applicant's remarks). The Patent Office respectfully submits that a customer is equivalent to a business partner. Because Applicant fails to define "business partner," the Patent Office is forced to interpret the claim limitations as broadly and as reasonably possible, in determining patentability of the disclosed invention.

For the reasons stated above, the rejections of claims 1-22 are sustained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alina N Boutah whose telephone number is 571-272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (9:00 am - 7:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ANB

ANB

William C. Vaughn
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2143
William C. Vaughn, Jr